

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS. P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,948	08/02/2006	Angelina Dekker	4662-220	5680
23117 7590 07/25/2007 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			CHO, JENNIFER Y	
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	1621	
<b>.</b>				
	·		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•			07/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	F				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/587,948	DEKKER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
·	Jennifer Y. Cho	1621			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however; may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	,				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 Au	ugust 2006.				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims	•	•			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	.*	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/2/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D  5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate			

#### **Detailed Action**

This office action is in response to Applicant's communication filed on 8/2/2006. Claims 1-6 are pending in this application.

#### IDS

The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on 8/2/2006 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

## **Claim Objections**

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: There should be a space in between "thepolyene". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word "antibiotoc" is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 4-6 are objected to because of the following informalities: The words "Mycophaerella fijensis" and "Fusarium oxysprorum" are misspelled. The appropriate

spelling is "Mycosphaerella fijiensis" and "Fusarium oxysporum". Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-6 provide for the use of a polyene antibiotic and natamycin, but since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966). See MPEP 2173.05(q).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Labourdette et al. (US 2004/0241098) and Beudeker (US 2002/0031504).

The instant claims are drawn to a method to treat banana plants against disease in which a polyene antibiotic, specifically natamycin, is preferably sprayed onto a banana plant to treat Mycosphaerella figiensis or Fusarium oxysporum.

Labourdette et al. teaches a method of treating banana plants against disease in which a polyene antibiotic, specifically natamycin (abstract; page 4, section 84, line 38; page 12, second column, line 17), is preferably sprayed (page 5, section 103, line 3) onto a banana plant (page 8, section 164, line 8) to treat Mycosphaerella figiensis (page 8, section 183, lines 1-2) or Fusarium oxysporum (page 8, section 180, lines 4-5).

Labourdette et al. is deficient in the sense that it recites natamycin within a list of antibiotics.

Beudeker teaches a method to treat plants against disease in which a polyene antibiotic, specifically natamycin (abstract; page 2, example 2, section 32, line 1), is applied to plants to treat Fusarium oxysporum (page 2, example 2, section 30, line 1).

Beudeker is deficient in that it is silent as to the specific types of plants that are treated, and the specific mode of application of the polyene antibiotic to the plant.

However, it would be prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Labourdette et al. and Beudeker, to develop a method in which natamycin is sprayed onto banana plants. Absent any showing of unusual and/or unexpected results over applicant's particular process, the art obtains the same effect on the treatment of the plants. The expected result would be an effective treatment for the fungal infection of banana plants.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer Y. Cho whose telephone number is (571) 272 6246. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM - 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on (571) 272 0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/587,948

Art Unit: 1621

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jennifer Cho Patent Examiner Art Unit: 1621

Yvonne Eyler

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1600